

Alan Watt
"Cutting Through The Matrix" Live On RBN (#241)

Poem Copyright Alan Watt Jan. 23, 2009:

Dream of Revolution through Evolution (Horus Unbound):

"How Many Knots Create a League?
How Many Circles to Cause Intrigue?
How Many Wars Must Waste and Ravage
To Conquer and Tame the Noble Savage?
And Once He's Tamed to Whose Advantage
Does This Pyramid Stand?
For the Base Comprises the People, Then Rises
High Above the Land,
Seething Energy from Those Below
Fuels the Few Near Top, Who'll Go
On Through Ages Yet to Come,
When Memory of Man is Done,
Like Staging Rockets, That's All We Are,
Propelling an Elect Who Will Go Far"
© Alan Watt Jan. 23, 2009

Friday 23rd January 2009

**Poem & Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - Jan. 23, 2009 (Exempting Music,
Literary Quotes, and Callers' Comments)**

www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

"Code of Silence" by Bruce Springsteen

There's a code of silence that we don't dare speak
There's a wall between us and a river so deep
And we keep pretending that there's nothing wrong
But there's a code of silence and it can't go on

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on January the 23rd, 2009.

I always suggest to newcomers to look into www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com and, on the website, you'll find hundreds of hours of talks I've given, in the past, which concern us all, because I try go into the histories of the big system in which we live and how it came to be this way; and, I try and show you the powers behind it. By using their own documentation, I show you where they intend to take us all - and why as well.

Look into www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu where you can download transcripts of these talks and they're written in the various languages of Europe. You can print them up and pass them round to your friends or read them at your leisure.

Look into www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com website and you can see the items I have for sale that keeps me going. I don't ask for payment from any of the shows I've been on and the ads you hear on the shows I am on, go towards paying the bills for the stations and staff and so on, a very expensive business. You can also donate as well; and, really, it's donations from the same few people that tend to keep me going this far. So, it's up to you, if the information is of value to you, you can donate; and, if not, then listen to someone else, that's freedom.

This last while, I've been going into the techniques of control of the minds of most of humanity. I've gone into how the marketing engineers, basically, designed and gave us the culture, especially in the Western countries, mainly in the US, based on consumerism and that Bernays (the nephew of Freud) is accredited with starting off this science in a big way; but, he shouldn't be given so much acclamation, because he wasn't the originator of propaganda, by any means. It was being well-studied in a previous century, and many centuries before that too; at least, in the 1800s, various books came out on the behaviour of the masses. Much of it was done by the Marxist groups, who needed the masses, to get their goals to come to fruition to be achieved.

I've also shown you how another group, a combination of groups really, they call them Circles that are all intertwined and you have to visualise them much like you see the Olympic flag: circles triangulating with other circles, intersecting with other circles; and, that's a system that has been planning for centuries. How old it is? You can trace it back for hundreds of years. I've been reading from Professor Carroll Quigley, who gives you the beginnings of one part of it, another phase of it, I would say, starting with Cecil Rhodes, who, supposedly was so enthused by the lectures he got at Oxford University, by Dean Ruskin, that he came up with the idea, all on his own, to create a British Empire system that became a nucleus of a world system. It would spread the same culture and system across the whole planet; and, ultimately, of course, the dream was to become a world government. This was taken up by Lord Alfred Milner, in his group, and the Round Table Societies. That's what I'm talking about, it's Circles, they also have Inner Circles and very few people, even the higher members, are unaware who the top people are and Quigley admits that too himself; and, they're still going at it yet, every Treaty we've got comes from the same groups. I'll be back with more - after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix. As Mr. Rockefeller always says:

If you don't know history, you don't know what's happening, you won't know why.

and he's quite correct, because what we get today, is nothing but propaganda, very carefully-engineered propaganda, because they understand the workings of the human mind and how we come to conclusions and therefore, really, under the many guises they go under, they could be called the 'conclusions makers' because we come to their conclusions.

This group, as I say, was involved in setting up the basis for a North American Union. They still are, they're the ones who draft up the agreements that are signed every year, the last one is to be signed in 2010, between Canada, Mexico and the

US. They came out openly and declared such, in 2005 on CBC television, Canada; and, it's astonishing, in a sense, that the major media allowed them on to say their piece and just tell the public why we must integrate to compete with Europe; and yet, here's the same group that was behind the unification of Europe, beginning a long time ago, because a hundred years' ago, that was one of their main objectives.

If you tie it in with Karl Marx, who wrote about the trading blocs that would come in the future, under world government, three regional trading blocs, primarily, at least that's how it would end up, with a Far Eastern bloc, a complete European bloc and also an American bloc, under a world government. These are the same boys who have never changed their directions, never ever changed their directions as to where they've been going. That's something, again, that Quigley and others have mentioned, that Foundations can hire and retire generations of people all employed on the same mandate, so it's not hard to see how they do it. What is difficult to understand, is how some of the Technocrats, the big players, can work their entire lives and never get fed up with it; they never put their feet up and say 'I'm going to go fishing, Martha' and retire. The Kissingers, these are the Technocrats, the Kissingers, the Maurice Strongs, the Brzezinskis, all these characters are working and jet-setting across the planet, giving talks still, on the same agenda, same agenda; and, they will claim it's for world peace, but then, when you go into Carroll Quigley's books (the *Anglo-American Establishment* and *Tragedy & Hope: A History Of The World In Our Time*), you'll see that this particular group has different branches of it, specialising in different areas, in their own records, because Quigley was a historian, he was allowed to get a hold of their records and update their history for them. In their own records, they admit that they were, in a way involved in the set-up of many of the wars that plagued the 20th Century. They were all for Vietnam initially, and then, later on, they were against Vietnam and that's the way they play the game.

They were responsible for the setting-up of The League of Nations and when it had run its course, they then turned against it and demanded a new system called the United Nations, they set-up the United Nations.

In my talks, I've mentioned how the CIA and many of its members were also members of the same Round Tables Societies, Council on Foreign Relations, intertwined completely with the Foundations that financed them; and, that really, for at least and probably longer, probably since the beginning of what we thought of democracy, we've never actually had it. Democracy is too fragile, they would claim, to be left to the people. We have to remember too, where the top members come from: they don't come from ordinary families or even middle class families, they come from the ruling elite, the established elite.

How long this established elite has been in existence is difficult to say. Did they set up in the 1700s an outfit that would eventually take over incredible financing, to become the major bankers, because their sons were all involved in these groups and worked tirelessly towards their ends? It's more than just a side play of politics, it's a method and a system to alter and shape all of society and eventually to bring it into this new scientific age, some will call it *scientific socialism* and when you go into their old-old records, you find they're completely intertwined with this cry that we hear today, they've been shouting this for a long-long time, for well over a hundred years: sustainability. We have eugenics coupled with it as well.

Now, remember, Quigley had to be a member to get access to the records; and, therefore, he's also an apologist for them. He lets a lot of the bag in his books, his plates were, for the books, actually were bought over and then broken up, so they wouldn't keep republishing it, they didn't want so much of this out of the bag; but, it was too late because others got a hold of it and copied it and there's still original books circulating in libraries, unless they've been all recalled. Universities definitely have original copies.

When you think of what they got up to and the fact, as I say, from their very beginning, their inception, at least as far back as Quigley goes, they were the ones that created the Boer War, this private group of people, a private Foundation basically, a society and he calls it a secret society and he says it was justly called that, it was very secretive. They started the Boer War, which killed an awful lot of people, they got Britain involved in it, by setting it up in such a way that the reporters they over with them, would report lies back to the British Government, so that Britain had to send troops out, to what they thought was to protect the Settlers who were being massacred. It was the other way around: the Cecil Rhodes group hired a bunch of guys and they attacked Jamestown and slaughtered a bunch of people. It was the other way around.

That's how they started off this organisation, by intrigue and deception; and, then when you follow their history down through the years, they literally had a hand in all publishing. Now, we're so used to data being thrown at us, we don't enquire where it comes from and, very seldom, do we ask what's the spin on it, what's the conclusion we're supposed to have at the end of it. It's admitted in Quigley's books that they had their hand in pretty well all the academic books put out there, so that, as you were getting history, you would get their version of history; and, their version of history is always written in the same slant: that humankind is just too unstable, it has to be mastered by an intellectual elite, who must accept their mastery. That's how you end up thinking and when you go into many of their members, and their Circles, as they say, all intertwined, they were pushing socialism. Remember: Carroll Quigley said himself that most people thought the Communists were doing most of this work in the United States, all these far left movements. They didn't know that it was the Council on Foreign Relations that was behind it, funded by the big Foundations. It appeared to be Communistic to the outsider, all left, far-left-leaning tendencies. They did the same in every country, including Britain.

When you look at the founding people of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, like the Astor family, these are the same family with their foundation that was also funding the Fabian Society. You go into the founders of the Fabian Society and you have H.G. Wells, a propagandist, again, for this group; he was the one who coined the term, in World War I, to get young men enthused. Young men can be very idealistic when they think they're fighting for a just cause and the slogan became:

"The war to end all wars"

You couldn't get more idealistic than that. Wells is also the man who dreamed up the idea - and Bernays would be very proud of him - and publicised it and got it through all the newspapers, through the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or because of them, since they owned all the newspapers, that the young men who wouldn't join, should be shamed into joining by their girlfriends and their fiancés,

who would wear a white feather in their cap. That's good psychological warfare or manipulation; they understood propaganda perfectly well.

As I said before: Bernays himself could not have accompanied President Wilson around on the peace campaign to set up the League of Nations, which was, again, in their own books here, The Anglo-American Establishment, was set up by the Royal Institute of International Affairs / Council on Foreign Relations. It couldn't have happened; he couldn't have got around to meet those high circles, without being part of it himself. Propaganda was not a new thing at all, it's a science, these sciences are perfectly-well understood.

You wonder why Adolf Hitler held back at Dunkirk. You have to look into, again, The Anglo-American Establishment, because the CFR and the Royal Institute of International Affairs was writing a lot of the script for this whole thing. They'd met with the top German leaders, before the war, and gave them lots of assurances and Carroll Quigley said here that they were behind allowing Germany to take Czechoslovakia, as a pawn basically. Then, when you go into the double-game they're always playing, to achieve their ends, from the end of World War I to World War II, they were propping up Germany, against the Soviet Union, and hoped that one day they eventually might attack Russia, go eastwards, which is exactly what Hitler did. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix. To understand the present you have to understand the past and you have to understand those who have helped pull the strings, across the whole planet, for an awful long time. It's hard for most people to put together: bankers, charitable foundations, as they appear, and what appears to them as well as being semi-governmental organisations, which are not governmental at all. They've many members within governments across the planet, but they're a private organisation that have been manipulating the planet for an awful long time; and, through conflict, they're trying to bring it all together; that's the old-old story of creating the Hegelian Dialectic.

How do you get people to merge? How do you get Europe to merge? And, they discussed wars, wars until people were sick of wars and until they'd just throw their hands up and say 'please save us from ourselves', hopefully. They always want the victim to think it's his fault, that's the best method of psychological warfare; and therefore, once you've had years of war and rationing, death and famine and all the rest of it, you can be guided along the plan that's been made long ago.

Winston Churchill, as I said yesterday, I read a bit from this particular book The Anglo-American Establishment, where he spoke about it in Parliament. He was not 'in', at that time, on the higher circles, he still had the same dream of a united Europe and it's so amazing to hear the old recordings of Churchill's speeches. He started it and Roosevelt started it in the US, their fireside chats to the people, you know, just cosy and just your next-door neighbour talking to you. That was the whole PR part behind it, the propaganda works well. When Churchill talked about uniting Europe, their age-old idea, to his peer group at night, during their parties. This was recorded in the book The Fringes of Power by his personal secretary John Colville, I think he's now Sir John Colville, I think he got knighted. So, here he is during the day, making Path newsreels for the general public, with good

propaganda about going off to save your country, your way of life and all the rest of it, while, with his own peer group, he's talking about their age-old plan, "Our age-old plan". Who's 'We'? Who's we, because I think the people of Europe, the average person had never ever had dreamt of it; so, who are 'we'? Our age old-plan. Eventually, he was brought in as Prime Minister, to the higher workings, obviously, and he simply may have been peeved that a higher part of the circle had kept him out of the picture, because in 1946, in Zurich, Winston Churchill's speech was given to the academic youth and it says:

"Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am honoured to-day by being received in your ancient university and by the address which had been given to me on your behalf and which I greatly value.

I wish to speak to you to-day about the tragedy of Europe. This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and the most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the western world.

He goes on to say

It is the fountain of Christian faith and Christian ethics ...

and so on, it was very important, at that time, to use religion, in your propaganda. He says:

It is the origin of most of the culture, the arts, philosophy and science both of ancient and modern time. If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, to the prosperity and the glory which its three or four million people would enjoy. Yet it is from Europe that have sprung that series of frightful nationalistic quarrels, originated by the Teutonic nations in their rise to power, which we have seen in this twentieth century and even in our own lifetime, wreck the peace and mar the prospects of all mankind.

And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the smaller States have indeed made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, care-worn and bewildered human beings gape at the ruins of their cities and their homes, and scan the dark horizons for the approach of some new peril, tyranny or terror.

He goes on to talk about tyranny, terror and babbles of voices and so on because he's getting to the point. The point is, of course, that now with the threat of atom bomb, they couldn't have another war; and that sounds very nice and idealistic, we don't want wars, do we? Then he goes on to talk about the unification of Europe, as the only answer to it:

Yet all the while there is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted by the great majority of people in many lands, would as if by a miracle transform the whole scene, and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is to-day. What is this sovereign remedy? It is to re-create the European Family,

To re-create the European Family.

or as much of it as we can, and to provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom. We must build a kind of United States of Europe.

Doesn't that sort of hearken back to Marx again? And, to Benjamin Franklin; remember, Franklin was way into the revolutionary idea, of course, he was a Founding Father, he was also the Ambassador to France, he was the head, the Grand Master of the Nine Sisters Lodge. He initiated Voltaire into that Lodge and they were all about revolution. I'll be back with more of this, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix, trying to find out why things are happening in our lifetime actually happen, only to find out they were planned long before we were born. And, much intrigue and manipulation went in to creating the wars, in fact Carroll Quigley mentions, in *The Anglo-American Establishment*, how the Milner-Rhodes Society, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Council on Foreign Relations propped up Hitler, right up to the war started. We all know that, again, the same characters that ran and owned the big foundations were funding these particular groups, also created IG Farben, which created the German war machine. You think of the length of time Adolf Hitler was in, it was only a few years, from destitution to having a massive military machine; where did that come from? Read the *Trials and Punishment of IG Farben*, amongst other books, there's quite the trail, because, you'll find, it's the same people that's been behind everything; and they're still at this world empire business today and if it takes wars to get there, they'll have them.

Getting back to this speech by Winston Churchill, he says:

We must build a kind of United States of Europe. In this way only will hundreds of millions of toilers be able to regain the simple joys and hopes which make life worth living. The process is simple. All that is needed is the resolve of hundreds of millions of men and women to do right instead of wrong and to gain as their reward blessing instead of cursing.

Much work, Ladies and Gentlemen, has been done upon this task by the exertions of the Pan-European Union

This was the precursor they tried for it.

which owes so much to Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and which commanded the services of the famous French patriot and statesman Aristide Briand.

He then goes on to talk about the League of Nations, he says:

The League of Nations did not fail because of its principles or conceptions. It failed because these principles were deserted by those States who had brought it into being.

He's calling them States here, remember, not Nations.

It failed because the governments of those days feared to face the facts, and act while time remained. This disaster must not be repeated. There is therefore much knowledge and material with which to build; and also bitter dear bought experience to stir the builders.

Because they're builders; they love building bridges and things.

I was very glad to read in the newspapers two days ago that my friend President Truman had expressed his interest and sympathy with this great design.

Great Design and building.

There is no reason why a regional organization of Europe

They call it regions today, under the United Nations.

should in any way conflict with the world organization of the United Nations. On the contrary, I believe that the larger synthesis will only survive if it is founded upon coherent natural groupings. There is already a natural grouping in the western hemisphere. We British have our own Commonwealth of Nations.

Now, going back to The Anglo-American Establishment, the League of Nations and eventually the United Nations, were to be established on the British Commonwealth of Nations and the term 'Commonwealth of Nations' was termed, as Quigley said, by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, this private organisation that works outside of democracy, although it uses their institutions, since in pretty well dominates them. He says:

These do not weaken, on the contrary they strengthen, the world organization. They are in fact its main support. And why should there not be a European group which could give a sense of enlarged patriotism and common citizenship to the distracted peoples of this turbulent and mighty continent? And why should it not take its rightful place with other great groupings and help to shape the onward destinies of men?

The Grand Design, that's my term, from theirs of course, from other books.

In order that this should be accomplished there must be an act of faith in which millions of families speaking many languages must consciously take part.

Then, he goes into, they always use history to try, and again, this is explained in Carroll Quigley's books, Anglo-American Establishment and Tragedy & Hope, how they always slant history, to make it seem that we're moving towards a natural unification of the planet; and, that all religions are working, in some metaphysical way, towards this amalgamation and that all political processes are kind of evolving by themselves, towards this same goal. Therefore, they spin their history to leave you, again, with the conclusion, which is the technique of propaganda.

As I say, these same people, today, are telling us that we must unite under a planetary system, because the new war is man against the planet and the planet against man. The Gaia concept as they say. It's quite something to really understand what's happening, because we live in propaganda pretty well all of the time. How far back do these groups and societies go? Well, you have to go back into the 1800s, at least, to get an idea when they were doing a lot of writing about revolution, because it's to do, really, with revolution; and, you must go into the writings of people like Robespierre and Voltaire, Bakunin, Trotsky, Lenin, all these people who talked about world systems, world societies, using the Socialist front.

Now, Socialism is an interesting term because it's like every other term that's used from God to Socialism, you get many different versions, according to who you ask. Here's an article here actually that ties right in with this, I'm just punching it up right now.

Let's go back to H.G. Wells, who was an official propagandist of this sect and the article says:

Nominally a socialist

We all think socialism is good, social is a nice word; they use these terms in propaganda that you'll relate to. Social is nice, we're all social beings. Socialist, 'ist', again, like 'ism', is a doctrine. Many people at the bottom think that if you're paying taxes into the system, you're supposed to get services back and that sounds pretty fair. If they're going to take it off you, why don't they give it back, in services; but it doesn't quite work that way, does it?

Now, remember, before the revolutions within the 1700s-1800s, governments simply taxed you and you got nothing back, nothing at all back; but you don't realise that even in Britain, there was no welfare system pretty well until the '50s. There was no unemployment insurance - that came through socialist movements, from the bottom. They went out on strike and a whole nation came to a standstill, because of miners and stuff like that. That's how they had to negotiate with those who ruled.

You take things for granted today, without knowing what really happened before, not so long before; and, this is a fact too: the only reason that you had all of these different schemes, including drug plans at work and stuff like that, little perks, was so that the West could say to their workers, see, we're pretty good here, we're pretty humane. If you've noticed since the Berlin Wall came down, they've all been gradually taken away, until there's very little left at the bottom. That's not by chance.

H.G. Wells, though nominally a socialist, was always in bed with the major Darwinist thinkers of the time.

They all were.

In this paragraph of New Worlds for Old, he talks about the theoretical similarities of what he terms true and noble anarchism, this is also the higher stage of Communism Marx and anarchists refer to. He states 'laboriously we mean to destroy false ideas of property and self.'

Property and self. Where do you find that same doctrine? Where do you find that? If you go into the writings of Pike and others, you'll find them there. The false ideas of property and self. Now, Communism too and Marxism blamed everything on property. You have to go back into the religions, down through the ages and the accompanying religions that always accompany them, often termed too, vaguely, as 'mystery religions' and we all go 'ooh' and 'ah' and we're scared and we're intrigued and so on; but there have always been fraternities down through the ages, that carry forth ideas. Plato was a member; he writes in his own books that he was a member of these sects. He studied in Egypt, that's where he was taught. His mentor was given hemlock for, supposedly, stirring up the young for revolution, revolution. Through revolution they get their way and Plato talked about a Utopia, for his own class, the intellectual elite, where they wouldn't have

to maintain their own property, the State would maintain it for them. Therefore, you would have an abolition of private property. Having private property himself, he said was a problem: you had to repair stuff, keep it up, the upkeep of it, replace stolen goods, fix things that break. Why not get those that you rule over to do it for you; and, you're living a life of luxury, but all the peasants below wouldn't have the same life of luxury.

This same theme has come down through the ages, Wells himself said that Plato was his favourite author and his favourite book was *The Republic*, by Plato.

false ideas of property and self

What's your false ideas of the self? The false ideas of your self. Well, the old idea was that man was the pinnacle of all creation and, when atheism was pushed to the fore, using Darwinism, we see the outcomes today. You have people like Richard Dawkins being promoted all over the planet for his statements that there's no God, just taking up the banner from Nietzsche and others and a big Foundation behind him is funding him to put banners across London's buses saying "*There's no God, get used to it*". Why would you care so much about what other people thought or believed, to go to this extent to put banners across buses? This person obviously could not live and let live. What you're up against is a totalitarian mind-set and that's where utter pure complete atheism will take you.

He also wrote the book *The Selfish Gene* and we laugh at this and think well, 'so what?'. Well, you see, his whole thesis on the *Selfish Gene*, meaning you're not a person, you're just a culmination of billions of cells, all fighting for their own survival and whatever thought that you have, whatever you appear to be, is a culmination of all these genes fighting each other. That's the nihilism that it brings you to; and, nihilistic thought like this and you have alienation and they call it that at the top, alienation, when you're so far removed from some will to keep you alive, you become nihilistic; and, nihilistic people can destroy many and that's the type we have at the top. That theory, by the way, of you're not a person, you're just the outcome of billion of cells, competing for survival, was adapted into Game Theory and used by the CIA and the Rand Corporation, through your computers, to analyse all of us as people and I'm sure we're all very disposable because we're really nothing special anymore, we're just a 'freak of nature.'

In H.G. Wells's *New Worlds for Old*, 1908, he says:

That Anarchist world, I admit, is our dream;

He's speaking on behalf of the Fabian Society. Remember George Bernard Shaw, that wrote *Man and Superman*, meaning the old man must die off, a new type will be created. Funded by the Astors, who are also part of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and funded them as well.

That Anarchist world, I admit, is our dream; we do believe - well, I, at any rate, believe this present world, this planet, will some day bear a race beyond our most exalted and temerarious dreams, a race begotten of our wills and the substance of our bodies, a race, so I have said it, "who will stand upon the earth as one stands upon a footstool and laugh and reach out their hands amidst the stars," but the way to that is through education and discipline and law.

Education and discipline and law - that's the methods they would use to

indoctrinate, towards their ideal.

Socialism is the preparation for that higher Anarchism; painfully, laboriously we mean to destroy false ideas of property and self, eliminate unjust laws and poisonous and hateful suggestions and prejudices, create a system of social right-dealing and a tradition of right feeling and action.

I guess that's the right stuff eh? What kind of rite does he belong to?

Socialism is the schoolroom of true and noble Anarchism, wherein by training and restraint we shall make free men.

Free from what? From being you. I don't know if you saw the outcome of the great experiment of the Sovietisation system that was carried out for an awful long time, where authors and poets were dragged up, because of certain words they'd use that were not in line with the Proletariat ideal; and, you were cross-examined and books were not allowed to be published, if a wrong phrase or word was put in there. Everything had to be for the one system, towards the one system, there was no self; there was no self, what does he say here? *"To destroy the self"*.

In the cold light of day, H.G. Wells calls for eugenics and dictatorship through committees and can be seen as the hell so clearly portrayed in Huxley's Brave New World and Orwell's 1984. However unappealing to anarchists this vision may be, H.G. Wells's claims are no more objectionable than Propotkin's claim for The Beehive.

Read who Propotkin was, because these are very important people, because their systems have all been combined. *Claim for the beehive*, that was his beehive, as his vision of Anarcho-syndicalism, they called it. Again, more circles coming together.

Although an anarchist may reject Scientific Socialism, it is a rejection of its means, not its ends. Bakunin is very clear on this in Catechisms of a Revolutionist.

That was printed in 1869. What does it say in that book? Now listen to this:

The Revolutionist is a doomed man.

This is a dedication here that Orwell put it in his own book 1984 as the oath they swear, showing you what the true revolutionist was.

He has no private interests, no affairs, sentiments, ties, property nor even a name of his own. His entire being is devoured by one purpose, one thought, one passion - the revolution.

All that was, was to be totally destroyed.

Heart and soul, not merely by word but by deed, he has severed every link with the social order and with the entire civilized world; with the laws, good manners, conventions, and morality of that world.

I'll be back with more of this very important stuff, it's happening today, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and we're Cutting Through The Matrix and I'm reading part of a book, 1869, Catechism of a Revolutionist by Mikhail Bakunin and Sergi Nechayev. To continue where I left off, because this is the Catechism of a revolutionist. This is the true belief of the true revolutionist:

He is its merciless enemy

That's society and the world.

and continues to inhabit it with only one purpose - to destroy it. He despises public opinion. He hates and despises the social morality of his time,

What have we seen happening through the whole 20th Century? And remember what I said, from Carroll Quigley, when the CIA were into the Culture Creation business and the same members in the CIA were also in the CFR and people thought it was all the Communists who were bringing the system down and changing the mores of the public.

He despises public opinion. He hates and despises the social morality of his time, its motives and manifestations. Everything which promotes the success of the revolution is moral; everything which hinders it is immoral. The nature of the true revolutionist excludes all romanticism, all tenderness, all ecstasy, all love.

As I say: you'll find that Orwell put that in his book 1984, when O'Brien gives him the dictionary which has the double pages inside, he had to peel off and find out the revolutionist bible, basically, inside of it. It was the same ideal.

H.G. Wells sees the New World Order as occurring basically outside his lifetime, Bakunin see this process and the goal of the extinction of self and property as its most urgent revolutionary aim. It in no small way recalls Orwell's fictional recruitment meeting for the brotherhood in 1984.

That's the recruitment meeting idea, the brotherhood, in a sense.

The initiate is expected to throw all caution to the wind, because he says in that book, you're prepared to give your lives, prepared to commit murder, to commit acts of sabotage, which may cause the death of hundreds of innocent people, to betray your country to foreign powers.

What is it that Quigley says in the Anglo-American Establishment? These people, literally, have been involved in all the major wars, even setting them up, guiding them. What is it they said when 9/11 came down, at the CFR meeting, that was flashed all over the different videos on 9/11? They said at the CFR meeting, we can use this tragedy to our own good use, our own agenda. They always take things and use it for their agenda. Any disaster will do, because they do have an agenda.

Bakunin was unabashed in his encouragement for the worst excesses of the brotherhood's land-based piracy.

This is what he wrote in 1869.

The comrades of the International Working Men's Association

And he goes on to talk about the middle classes and so on and Freemasonry,

because there's no doubt about it, look at all your crests everywhere, and all the countries that came out of revolution. You've always got the pyramid; you've got obelisks all over the place. You have the Phoenix and what does the Phoenix symbolise: a new system arising, every few hundred years, out of the ashes of the old. What was it that Bakunin said? You destroy everything that's familiar - they hate it - to bring in the new.

I'll be back with more next week on the same topic and go in deeper. So, from Hamish and myself, from Ontario Canada, it's goodnight and may your god - or your gods - go with you.

Transcribed by Bill Scott.

Book Excerpts: [Continued] "Tragedy and Hope" and "The Anglo-American Establishment" by Carroll Quigley.

"Catechism of a Revolutionist" by Sergei Nechayev and Mikhail Bakunin.

**Speech: Winston Churchill's Speech to the Academic Youth (Zurich, 19.9.1946)
(at europa-web.de).)**